

HENRY CLAY SAYS THAT TEXAS WILL NOT INCREASE THE POWER OF THE SOUTH.

In his letter to the editors of the National Intelligencer, dated April 17, 1844, Mr. Clay uses the following language:

"But would Texas really add strength to that [the south] which is now considered the weakest part of the confederacy? If my information be correct, it would not. According to that, the territory of Texas is susceptible of a division into five States of convenient size and form. Of these two only would be adapted to the peculiar institutions [slavery] to which I have referred, and the other three, lying west and south of San Antonio, being only adapted to farming and grazing purposes, from the nature of their soil, climate and productions, would not admit of those institutions. In the end, therefore, there would be two slave, and three free States, probably added to the Union."

THE EXTENSION OF OUR TERRITORY.

The next most important objection to the annexation of Texas, is, that thereby our territory will be materially enlarged. Persons urging this argument forget that, if Texas is annexed to the Union, we will but have recovered our lost property—that we will but repossess ourselves of the soil which was wrongfully transferred to Spain, and that we will simply replace our boundary lines where they stood for sixteen years, and would now be, but for mistake or mismanagement.

This is the same objection urged to the purchases of 1803 and 1819. The cry then was, as now, "You are making the country too large!" But it may well be asked, what danger is to result from the extension of our territory? Should we introduce new interests or a hostile population, the objection would have some plausibility, but Texas has no interest different from ourselves, and we and her sons are children of the same common parent.

The fewer the number of States, the more readily can our Union be subverted. If we had only thirteen, as originally, seven States would constitute a majority, and could overthrow the balance. With our present number, it would require double seven to accomplish the same object; and the greater the number of States, the more traitors will it require to subvert our present admirable fabric. Had our Union consisted of a few States, the Hartford Conventionists of the last war would have stopped the wheels of government, and enabled a British foe to tread our soil in safety; and in 1832, the nullifiers of the south might have occasioned just alarm for the permanency of our confederacy.

For all practical purposes, the distance between places is not to be computed so much by the extent of territory intervening, as by the time it requires to pass from point to point. Maine and Louisiana are now nearer together than were Baltimore and Cincinnati thirty years ago. The journey from our federal seat of government to Texas, may be performed in eight or nine days. When New Orleans was added to our territory, it required forty days to pass from that place to the city of Washington. Consequently, Texas is now, for all practical purposes, about one fourth the distance from our seat of government than New Orleans was at the time of its purchase from France. Hence, the argument against the extension of our territory applies with three fourths less force to the acquisition of Texas than to the purchase of what is now Louisiana proper. Who is willing to surrender our claim to Oregon? and yet three months are required to pass from the States to that territory.

HENRY CLAY SAYS THERE IS NO DANGER FROM THE EXTENSION OF OUR TERRITORY.

In Mr. Clay's eloquent speech, delivered 3d April, 1820, against the transfer of Texas to Spain, he uses the following language: [See Greeley's life and speeches of Clay, vol. 1, p. 14.]

"I know that there are honest and enlightened men who fear that our confederacy is already too large, and that there is danger of disruption, arising out of want of reciprocal adherence between its several parts. I hope, and believe, that the principle of representation, and the formation of States will preserve us a united people."

But again, look to the almost miraculous increase of our population—behold our new States and territories filling up as if in a day—gaze upon the never-ending tide of emigration which is hourly pouring in upon us from Europe, and then answer if there is danger of our possessing too much territory. We are not to legislate for our own generation alone, but to behave us to contemplate the future. In one century from the present time, what will be the population of this republic? In two and in three centuries, who dare set bounds to its incalculable numbers? And do we wish our posterity huddled together as in degraded Europe, or still more miserable Asia? God forbid!

Neither must the administration of Jefferson be forgotten—that towns and cities are sowing upon the body politic; and the more sparsely populated the country, the greater is the likelihood of the flourish of virtue and patriotism.

WAR WITH MEXICO.

The third objection to the annexation of Texas, is, that thereby we will involve ourselves in a war with Mexico. This argument is worthy of but slight attention. If we have right on our side, as we must assuredly have, our Union fears no power in Christendom, nor will she be turned from her path by blustering menaces, let them come from what quarter they may. We should, it is true, be more scrupulous in respecting the rights of Mexico than, perhaps, those of any other government on earth. Her insignificance should protect her from injustice, for she is a poor, miserable, weak, rickety, and tottering fabric, at best, and is entitled to our pity and compassion, if not to our prayers. What! the American Eagle pounce upon Mexico? As well might he stoop from his towering height to seize upon the sparrow! It is not consistent with the character of our republic to oppress the weak. Her history establishes the reverse, for she has always been the first, or among the first, to recognize the independence of the feeble and the down-trodden. But while determined to inflict no injustice upon her, it makes one smile to think of Mexico threatening to declare war against the United States. Why, in the winter of 1836, '37, when the gallant General Felix Huston, the commander of the Texian forces spoke of marching his sixteen or eighteen hundred penniless soldiers (whose chief uniform consisted of a strip of linen streaming out behind them) into her territory, and seizing upon Matamoros, a panic spread throughout Mexico, and if rumor does not falsify, there was a shaking of bones in the regions of the far-famed palace of the

Montezuma. The appearance of five thousand well appointed American troops, properly equipped and provisioned, would throw Mexico into convulsions, from which she would recover but to learn the downfall of her empire.

General Jackson speaks like a philosopher and patriot on this, as upon all other subjects. In his letter of May, 13, 1844.

"In reference to Mexico, I would use the following language: We have carefully abstained from all interference with your relations to Texas, except to acknowledge her independence, in the same manner, and upon the same principles, that we did your independence when you separated from Spain. We have, indeed, been more scrupulous with you than with Spain, for, without consulting or respecting the feelings of the latter power, our government did not hesitate to open a negotiation with you for the retrocession of Texas, and that, too, long before your independence was acknowledged by Spain. But the time has now come when we feel that this delicacy ought no longer to restrain us from a treaty with Texas, particularly as we know that our failure to do so will produce results that may endanger the safety of our own confederacy."

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF ANNEXATION.

It is also asserted that the annexation of Texas would be a violation of the constitution. Did Jefferson violate the constitution when he purchased Louisiana from France? Did Monroe violate the constitution when he purchased the Floridas from Spain? And did the two Congresses which sanctioned and ratified those measures also violate the constitution? If Louisiana and Florida were annexed constitutionally, then may Texas also be, for it surely cannot be constitutional to annex territory at an expense of forty millions, and unconstitutional to annex it when we get the land for nothing. The position assumed by demagogues and dolts, that, if Congress can annex territory to the United States, it can also annex the United States to some foreign government, is too contemptible to merit even a passing notice. It is argued used alone by such pure patriots as can look complacently and behold Great Britain stuffing into her insatiable maw all the governments on earth, that she has power to subdue or gold to purchase, but when our glorious Union attempts honorably to recover a noble domain, which was once its own, must raise the cry, "It is unconstitutional!"

THE HUE AND CRY ABOUT SPECULATIONS.

The attempt made by its enemies to induce the impression that annexation is mainly contended for by speculators and others interested in the advance of property in Texas, is no less futile than unjust. The same impulse that prompts Americans to refuse to surrender Oregon to the British, renders them zealous friends of reacquiring that which was our own, and will be England's unless annexed to the United States. What matters it to the mere speculator, whether property advances in Texas from her connection with England or with the United States? The effect would be the same in either event. Was Henry Clay actuated by a desire to speculate in lands or scrip, when he instructed the American minister at Mexico to offer that government millions for the repurchase of Texas? Was John Quincy Adams actuated by the same sordid motive, when he acquiesced in those instructions? Was Martin Van Buren in pursuit of private gain when he gave instructions similar to those of Mr. Clay? Were all the members of the State Legislatures, which have unanimously adopted resolutions favorable to annexation bribed and corrupted by the desire to speculate in lands and scrip. Is the *Hero of New Orleans* governed by a love of plunder and speculation, when he declares that the safety of our own country demands the annexation of Texas? The men who raise this cry about speculators, should first have cleansed their skirts of the putrid filth which smeared them, from wallowing in the rotten carcasses of broken banks. They had better first dry up the tears of the widow and the orphan, by restoring to them the property out of which they have been robbed by shaving operations in depreciated paper and canal scrip. They should have cleared their characters of the infamy which blackens them, on account of these and other plunderings, before they accuse such men as Andrew Jackson, Thomas H. Benton, Lewis Cass, James Buchanan, Richard M. Johnson, Charles Stewart, and a long list of other patriots, of being governed by a love of plunder and of speculation.

[To be continued.]

A BANK IS ONE OF THE ISSUES.

In 1840 the whig party, from Ewing down, blinked the question of a national bank. They got power, and it was one of the first of their measures. That they were guilty of fraud and duplicity in this, Mr. TYLER is, in two ways, a living proof. They first took him up knowing that he had always opposed such a measure, to carry the vote of Virginia. They next denounced him, because—although he signed their Bankrupt law, their bill to repeal the Independent Treasury, their Distribution law, and all their other measures—he would not approve the *fisc alities*. For this and for nothing else, did they call him traitor, and heap upon him all the anathemas and abuse which their foiled fraud upon the people could conjure together.

To some extent the same game of skulking duplicity is going on now. Listen to a whig speech in the market space, and you will hear nothing but *Tariff and Texas*. The Bank, more repugnant to the constitution, more deleterious to the best interests of the country, more odious to the majority of the people, than any or all of the catalogue of whig measures propounded by Mr. CLAY at the extra session, besides—the Bank is studiously kept in the background. Not a word about it—if any thing is said, it is wrapped up in some such cunning phrase as "A sound national currency, regulated by the will and authority of the nation." As though words were things, and the people were to be amused and humbugged by such means.

There is, however, some honesty extant among the whig orators and editors. From the New York Republic, and from its report of a late speech made by JOSEPH L. WHITE, formerly of Madison, Ia., we clip the following paragraph:

"Thirdly, we stand again upon the old and tried issue of a National Bank. (Great applause.) He knew (said Mr. White) and he regretted to say it that even among whigs there were those who do not hesitate to proclaim, without distinction of time or circumstances, that the question of a National Bank is not in issue now; but such assertions do but deceive the people and are made either through ignorance, or with a determination to defraud the people. He cautioned his hearers not to

give ear to that whig orator or whig editor who would deceive them by any such subterfuge. Let the whig party stand or fall with the integrity of their principles—for himself he would abide the issue, and fall with those principles or any one of them."

To this paragraph we call the special attention of the *Atlas* and the *Gazette*, and of the *Careys et id omne genus*, who have mounted the stump. We desire to know, whether they are "ignorant" of whig principles, or whether they have "a determination to defraud the people?" We shall poke them out, or try hard for it. They must come up to the scratch and meet this question in good faith.

A National Bank is neither "necessary" nor "proper." It is not necessary, as every day's experience shows. We are better off without it, than we were with it. It is not proper—for it has made war upon the government, turned committees of the people's representatives from its doors, renounced the people's President a counterfeiter and a fugitive from the penitentiary, and finally swindled the people themselves out of untold thousands. It has been the prolific mother of more profligacy, dishonesty and distress than all other causes combined. It has exemplified its fearful capacity for corruption in the person of HENRY CLAY himself—who pronounced it wholly unconstitutional in 1811, yet in a few years was won to its support by large sums of money received from it under the name of attorney's fees. And its really monarchical and dangerous character is startlingly displayed by that same HENRY CLAY, in his Raleigh speech, where he tells the American people that we want a National Bank, because all the despots of Europe have such institutions.

This, fellow citizens, is one of the whig measures. They shall not blink it, or shuffle away from its support. Let our friends pin them up to the question. If they disavow it, says Mr. WHITE, they are either ignorant, and have therefore no right to undertake the instruction of the people; or dishonest, and therefore should be treated with contempt.—*Cincinnati Enquirer*.

THE TEXAS QUESTION—ITS DEBT.

Negotiations for the purchase of Texas by John Q. Adams and Henry Clay, in 1825.

"The Texas debt and the interest thereon, against it becomes due, at a fair estimate, will be about \$180,000,000."—*T. Ewing's speech*.

"She [Texas] has not one acre of unappropriated land."—*Same*.

Now Mr. Ewing either knew these declarations to be entirely false, or he knew nothing about it. But we cannot suppose him ignorant of the true situation of Texas.—The correspondence accompanying the treaty shows, that the public lands in Texas amount to 203,500,000 acres, of which quantity there have been appropriated as appears 67,388,673 acres—leaving 136,111,327 acres to meet the paltry debt of ten millions of dollars. Here are her means, and her whole debt, and it is perfectly apparent to any one that she is able to pay it and have means in abundance left. All the honest ex-secretaire said about her debt is mere slang and nonsense, not entitled to a moments consideration in settling the question of annexation.

Mr. Clay's view of the treaty of 1819, that Texas was ours in spite of the treaty provisions, was more in keeping with the characteristic boldness of the man than with the coolness of the statesman. Our title to it was then clearly relinquished, and the mere fact that we once claimed this territory is no good argument why we should now have it.—Yet in considering this subject, the opinions advanced while the claim was urged are of interest and importance. As such we have before referred to them. We shall now speak of the negotiations entered into to recover this territory. If there be "crime" in the project to annex Texas to the Union—if it be an "infernal plot"—if it bodes an unmitigated mass of "evil" to our country, as Mr. Ewing charged, it is well that the people should know the whole history of its conception. But, in sounding the tocsin of Texas alarm, Mr. Ewing is as silent as the grave about negotiations prior to 1837; yet surely, if the history of this business be faithfully given, the agency of other administrations in it should not be overlooked. More especially as this very alarm is stimulated by those who hold up as the "embodiment" of their principles a man so intimately connected with the plan of annexing Texas to the Union as Mr. Clay. Before proceeding to this negotiation, we will allude to an interesting incident to show the then existing feelings of John Q. Adams—president—with respect to Texas. In 1822, Mr. Adams was charged by Gov. Floyd of Virginia, with having sacrificed the interests of the south in relinquishing Texas to Spain in the treaty of 1819. This charge was repeated by Col. Benton in 1830, in the memorable debate on Mr. Foot's resolutions. Mr. Holmes, who was one of the committee on foreign relations in 1820, then repelled this charge as follows:—

"I do know that the distinguished citizen (Mr. Adams) was the last who gave up the Colorado for a boundary, and accepted of the Sabine."

Mr. Smith, of Maryland, said in the same debate that—

"A quarrel had taken place between the gentleman alluded to (Mr. Adams) and Don Onis, the minister on the part of Spain, and they had separated not to meet again on the subject; that the quarrel had arose as he was informed and believed on the determination of the American negotiator that the Colorado must and should be the boundary line that the negotiators met again at the request of mutual friends; what passed afterwards he did not know, further than that he could assure the Senator from Missouri that the gentleman alluded to by him was not the first to recede to the Sabine as the boundary line."

When the tenacity with which Mr. Adams was disposed to hold on to Texas is considered, and also the boldness with which Mr. Clay opposed the ratification of the treaty of 1819, it is not surprising that both should, when in power, desire to regain this territory. But the power that held Texas was now not Spain, but Mexico. The war of revolution, in the latter country, had been going on for years, with varying success. In 1821 Mexico adopted a regular government, and her statesmen claimed for her virtual independence. On the 8th of March, 1822, President Monroe recommended to congress the establishment of political relations with the late Spanish colonies of North America. The right, then, of Mexico to the territory of Texas was based on the same foundation as our own right to treat in 1783, or the right of Texas itself to treat now, viz: on the foundation of successful resistance. It was while Mexico was at war with Spain, and in the face of eyes of an official remonstrance by the latter, that Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay negotiated with the former for Texas.

J. Q. Adams' administration commenced March 4, 1824, and Mr. Poinsett, who had been sent to

Mexico by President Monroe as an informal agent, as early as 1822, was received as minister in Mexico in June 1815. On the 26th of March 1825, Mr. Clay—then secretary of state—drew up a letter of instructions to Mr. Poinsett. He dwells upon the subject of the establishment of the limits between the territories of the United States and Mexico, and directs Mr. Poinsett to sound the Mexican government in relation to the establishment of a new line. Mr. Clay says—

"The line of the Sabine approaches our great western mart nearer than could be wished. Perhaps the Mexican government may not be unwilling to establish that of the Rio Brasso de Dios, or the Colorado, or the snow mountains, or the Rio del Norte, in lieu of it."

He then suggests some reasons which might induce the government to consent to the change, and names as a reason why we should have Texas, the importance of having entirely within our limits "the Red River and Arkansas, and their tributary streams." In drawing up these instructions for the annexation of Texas, Mr. Clay says, "the president wishes you to effect that object."

This subject was renewed two years later—1827; and Mr. Poinsett was instructed to urge negotiation for Texas. In a letter dated March 15, 1827, Mr. Clay says—

"If we could obtain such a boundary as we desire, the government of the United States might be disposed to pay a reasonable pecuniary compensation. The boundary we prefer is that which beginning at the mouth of the Rio del Norte in the sea, shall ascend that river to the mouth of the Rio Puerco thence ascending this river to its source and from its source by a line due north to strike the Arkansas at its source in latitude 42 degrees north, and thence by that parallel of latitude to the south sea."

Mr. Clay further instructed Mr. Poinsett to offer a sum not exceeding one million of dollars for this immense territory; or, if he could not obtain the line of the Rio del Norte for a boundary, then he might offer five hundred thousand dollars for the line of the Colorado river. He further states that the treaty may "provide for the incorporation of the inhabitants into the Union." A reference to the map of Texas will show, better than any description we can write, the great addition this proposition would have made—if accepted by Mexico—to our Union.

It should be borne in mind that these proposals of Henry Clay, to purchase Texas, were made while Mexico was struggling for her existence with Spain; consequently a war with the latter power must have followed its successful termination.

When all this is considered, what can exceed the reckless inconsistency of such men as Ewing and others of the whig party in endeavoring to turn this project to party accounts? Every where democratic statesmen are represented to be the Catalines who are maturing this "infernal plot" of annexation, and whig statesmen are the Ciceros who are to expose it and defeat it! It is the whig press and whig stupidity that is to save our country from this "dire calamity." All this, too, in the face of the fact that Henry Clay—who defended our title to Texas upon the Florida treaty of 1819—who contended that it was ours in spite of the treaty—who while secretary of state, endeavored to obtain it at the risk of a war with Spain and the loss of national honor—who, two years later, endeavored to purchase it at the cost of a million of dollars—is before the country as the "embodiment of whig principles!" What can exceed this reckless inconsistency? To save the country from this "infernal plot," the people must elect to the presidency a man who has done all that man could do to annex Texas to the Union! Oh, shame, where is thy blush?

Upon the whole, although the whigs may think they have given us a death blow by the exhibition of this "big gun" of whiggery, if we are not very much mistaken, it will operate to our advantage. Every one who heard him was more or less disappointed, and he might speak of doomsday and not a democrat would be frightened from his propriety; if any thing they are more confirmed and settled in their faith. But, on the other hand, if we can judge from the want of that enthusiasm which accompanies the support of a good cause, we should say that his own party was mortified. All we have to say to the whigs is bring us some more such speakers—let us have a few more such "great mass meetings."—*Guard*.

SOLITUDE EWING—RASCALLY FALSEHOOD.

This ex-Secretary of State made many unwarranted assertions in his speech yesterday. Does he suppose the people do not know anything!—What reason had he for declaring the Texas debt to be eighty or a hundred millions of dollars? Does he not know that his master, Henry Clay did not pretend in his celebrated Texas letter, to claim the Texas debt to be over *thirteen millions*, and was not sure it amounted to that?

Again, he appealed to farmers, asking them if they would be willing to pay that vast debt at an interest of ten per cent. This deception beats every thing. Is the Hon. Thomas Ewing so ignorant of current events as not to be aware that Texas has agreed to come into the Union and pay her own debts? or in other words, she has proposed to cede her public lands to the U. States in consideration of the latter becoming liable for *ten millions* of her debt, an amount probably exceeding what she owes. These were conditions of the late treaty to which Texas did not object. According to this treaty, Texas stock was to bear three per cent interest from the date of its being presented to the commissioners for a new certificate—not *ten per cent*. as "Solitude" declared to the people yesterday. For the payment of this debt and interest, "the public lands, and the net revenue from the same were pledged." Hence the people of the United States would not pay a cent of Texas debt.

Away with federal humbuggery!—It's pitiful to see men of the pretensions of Ewing practicing such unmitigated deceit and falsehood upon the people. The opponents of Jefferson pursued the same course towards that great man's administration during the time

he was negotiating for Louisiana. Their craven cry, however, was not heeded. The wisdom of the nation prevailed.—Generations, far in the future, will bless the name of Jefferson for that greatest act (save the framing of the Declaration of Independence,) of his eventful life.

Ewing has a great horror to Texas scrip! No wonder he should be startled at the mention of that term. His speculations in the article, scrip, by which he has beggared many an honest man, have been of such a character, that it is reasonable for him to conclude that no transactions can be done in such business without ruin falling upon some one.

Zanesville Aurora.



THE SPIRIT OF DEMOCRACY.

EDITED BY J. R. MORRIS.

WOODSFIELD.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 23, 1844.

FOR PRESIDENT,
JAMES K. POLK,
Of Tennessee.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
GEORGE M. DALLAS,
Of Pennsylvania.

ELECTORAL TICKET.

SENATORIAL.

JOSEPH H. LARWILL, of Wayne,
DOWDY UTTER, of Clermont.

CONGRESSIONAL.

1st District CLAYTON WEBB, of Hamilton,
2d " JAMES M. DORSEY, of Darke,
3d " R. D. FORSMAN, of Green,
4th " JUDGE JOHN TAYLOR, of Champaign
5th " DAVID HIGGINS, of Lucas,
6th " GILBERT BEACH, of Wood,
7th " JOHN D. WHITE, of Brown,
8th " THOMAS MEGRADY, of Ross,
9th " VALENTINE KEFFER, of Pickaway,
10th " JAMES PARKER, of Licking,
11th " GRENVILLE P. CHERRY, of Marion,
12th " GEORGE CORWINE, of Scioto,
13th " CAUTIOUS C. COVEY, of Morgan,
14th " ISAAC M. LANNING, of Guernsey,
15th " WALTER JAMIESON, of Harrison,
16th " SEABASTIAN BRAINARD, of Tuscarawas,
17th " JAMES FORBES, sr, of Carroll,
18th " NEAL MCCOY, of Wayne,
19th " MILO STONE, of Summit,
20th " BENJAMIN ADAMS, of Lake,
21st " STEPHEN N. SARGENT, of Medina.

DEMOCRATIC NOMINATIONS.—ELECTION, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8TH.

FOR GOVERNOR OF OHIO,
DAVID TOD, of Trumbull County.

FOR CONGRESS
JOSEPH MORRIS.

FOR REPRESENTATIVE,
EDWARD ARCHBOLD.

FOR COUNTY AUDITOR,
JOHN M. KIRKBRIDE.

FOR COUNTY COMMISSIONER,
JOHN CLINE.

FOR COUNTY SURVEYOR,
JOHN B. NOLL.

TOD AND VICTORY.

Hon. DAVID TOD, the Democratic candidate for Governor of Ohio, will address the people of this county at this place, on Saturday the 7th of September.

Invitations will also be extended to Messrs.

ALLEN and BROUGH.

Come up, Democrats, on the 7th by thousands. Come up, Whigs, hear for yourselves and then decide. Let all the true friends of our free institutions of whatever party or creed, COME! Let our German, and our Irish friends, COME! Let those in favor of our Naturalization Laws as they are COME! LET ALL COME!

DEMOCRATIC MEETING.

A Democratic Republican Meeting will be held at MORRIS' MILL, on the Clear Fork of Muskingum, on SATURDAY NEXT, (the 31st inst.)

Messrs. MORRIS, ARCHBOLD & several other prominent speakers will address the meeting. Meeting to commence at one o'clock P. M. Let every lover of liberty on Clear Fork attend this meeting; our country is bleeding at every pore from Federal misrule, and NOW is the time to hear, to understand and to decide.

—The Editor being absent from home will account for the lack of editorial, or any error that may occur in this week's paper.

COMMUNICATED.

Mr. Editor: I presume it would not be interesting to some of your subscribers who were not here on the 17th inst. at the whig mass meeting, to give them a short account of the great exertions and almost entire failure of the whigs on that occasion.

You are probably aware of their efforts to get up a mass meeting on that day, whether for the purpose of enlightening this benighted region, or displaying their unbounded benevolence and love for the dear people, or for some other reason, I cannot say,—certain it is that they left no means untried to get the people to turn out. They promised them that they should be entertained with speeches from some of the leaders of all the decency party, a band of music, and a public dinner—yes, a public dinner was to be prepared, and for this purpose they sent to Cincinnati and purchased two barrels of crackers and one whole cheese, to feed the multitude; and it is said that they offered four crackers and a slice of cheese, for each democrat that should turn out. How this was I do not know, but one thing I am sure of, that if they did not get their crackers devoured until they disposed of them in this way, the fragments would at least equal the quantity put upon the table.

The eventful day at length arrived, and with it came Ewing and Harper, the big guns of whiggery.

Now all was anxiety and expectation. Preparations were made for a mighty gathering of the people, marshals with their blue badges were mounted, horsemen were parading through the streets ready to meet the delegations from the east, west, north, and south, as they came in, and send up one long and loud shout for their leader, Clay. But imagine, Mr. Editor, their bitter disappointment when, instead of the people coming in crowds, some half a dozen would arrive at a time, (and many times one half of them democrats,) and when met by the whigs here, and called upon to raise their voices for Harry of the West, they said by their actions that he was not the man under whose banner they could rally—that they had no voice to raise for Clay—so that the only pretence at reviving the scenes of 1840, (for I will not charge that they were in earnest,) was made by a few of the leaders here, whilst the greater part of those in attendance were among the lookers on, many of them having come in to attend to their own business, others to see what was going on, without the least desire to engage in scenes similar to those enacted in the memorable campaign of 1840. After the procession was formed it was counted by a number of persons, amongst others a gentleman who has heretofore acted with the whig party, but who now, (like many others in this county who were foremost in the whig ranks in 1840,) will support Mr. Birney, and he says that there were 265 in the procession as they passed down street, all told—some make the number a little over that, and some under. This number with those that did not wish to march in the procession, formed the meeting. They next marched to the woods, and partook of a dinner of crackers which was soon dispatched, as those that came up first either devoured or carried away the entire contents of the of the board, and left those that followed either without dinner or compelled them to go and seek it elsewhere. They then repaired to the stand erected for the purpose, where they were first addressed by Mr. Harper, who tried to make the people believe that Henry Clay was the greatest man in the nation—that in order to make the people prosperous and happy it was only necessary to keep up their taxes by way of a tariff; this being hard to make the people in this part of the country believe, he closed his remarks. Next in order came Solitude Ewing, who prefaced his remarks by speaking of the good feeling that ought to exist between the two parties, and spoke of his kind feelings towards opponents, and then commenced by attacking Col. Morris, our democratic candidate for Congress. This unmanly and unjustifiable course was pursued because you, Mr. Editor, in your paper some weeks since, had said something on that most delicate subject, Mr. Ewing's scrip speculation. He charged that the article in your paper on that subject was a forgery, and that Mr. Morris was the author, and tried to make the impression that in your paper was the first he had ever seen any thing of the kind. He called upon Mr. Morris, who he said he understood was in the meeting, to know if he had published the article. Mr. Morris, being present, informed Mr. Ewing that he was not the editor nor had he published the article in question, and called upon Mr. Ewing to give the name of his informant, which Mr. Ewing refused to do, as it would have exposed him to shame and infamy, if a resident of this place, for every one here knows that Mr. Morris has nothing to do with the publication of your paper. After Mr. Ewing had closed his remarks, Mr. Morris informed them that the article was taken from the Ohio Statesman—that it had been published in many of the democratic papers years ago, and that it could not have escaped his notice—that he believed the charges there made to be true, and that if he had been the editor he would have published them as such. Whether Mr. Ewing voluntarily made the attack on Mr. Morris, or whether he was induced to do so by some whig who wished to injure our candidate for Congress in some way, and was afraid to make the attack himself, we are left in doubt. In either event they are welcome to all they made. The cheers of the democrats present will attest that they were foiled in their effort, and the base attack was hurled back with redoubled force upon their own heads. Mr. Ewing acknowledged that he had purchased scrip of some nine or eleven persons, and said that he had refunded the charge made to the Statesman. Of this we will see hereafter.

Mr. Ewing, during the course of his remarks, took much the same course as Mr. Harper,—that is, he came to about the same conclusion. As in 1840, they said but little about a United States bank, which is well known to be the favorite measure of Clay and the leaders of the party; but they fear to make the issue before the people.—They spoke with a great deal of bitterness against the annexation of Texas, swelled the amount of her public debt, and reduced the amount and value of her lands.

But alas for Mordecai Bartley!—you would scarcely have known that he was the whig candidate for governor of this great State, had it not been that his name appeared on some few flags that were made; in the moment of reflection you would not have known that there was such a man in being. In the evening, what few remained in town were addressed by Jo Ramage, who calls himself the independent candidate for Congress in this district. Why style himself the independent candidate? Is he becoming tired of Cooney, or does he think to get the vote of a single democrat by coming out in this way? We can assure him that the democracy in this county are too well acquainted with him to give him their support in any event. In his remarks he cried out against party, and at the same time took care to advance nothing but the most ultra doctrine of the whig party of the present day.

Yours, &c.

SPECTATOR.

OPINION.—I willingly concede to every man what I claim for myself—the freest range of thought and expression; and am perfectly indifferent whether the sentiments of others on speculative subjects coincide with or differ from my own. Instead of wishing or expecting that uniformity of opinion should be established, I am convinced that it is neither practicable, nor desirable; that varieties of thought are as numerous and as strongly marked, and as irreducible to one standard, as those of bodily form; and that to quarrel with one who thinks differently from ourselves, would be no less unreasonable than to be angry with him for having features unlike our own.—*Prof. Lawrence*.

When the few Simon Pures who went to Marshall to the whig celebration, came in on the cars, yesterday, a democrat stepped up to the cars and said, "Well—what kind of a time did you have?" The whig replied, "another such meeting" would use us up in this State if we are not already."

Detroit Free Press